Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Claims 21-35 are pending. Claim 1 has been canceled.

Deletion of Inventors

The Examiner has stated that the deletion of inventors in the present application is deficient, citing 37 CFR 1.48(b). However, as noted on the Transmittal submitted upon filing the present application, the application was filed in accordance with 37 CFR 1.63(d)(2), which states

> (2) The copy of the executed oath or declaration submitted under
> this paragraph for a continuation or divisional application must be
> accompanied by a statement requesting the deletion of the name or
> names of the person or persons who are not inventors in the
> continuation or divisional application.

A copy of the executed declaration was submitted with the application, and was accompanied by a signed statement in the preliminary amendment (also filed in conjunction with the present application) requesting the deletion of the names of the persons who are not inventors in the continuation application.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the inventors were properly deleted upon the filing of the present application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 21-24, 26-31, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,480,860 to Monday ("Monday"). As the PTO provides in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."

Therefore, the Monday patent must disclose all of the elements of the claims to sustain the rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following grounds.

Claims 21-24, 26, and 27

Claim 21 recites, in part, determining whether an object references a system service, dynamically loading the service if referenced, dynamically configuring the service, and instantiating the object in the class factory, so that the service referenced by the object in the XML stream is automatically available to the object.

In contrast, Monday is directed towards "[a]n apparatus and method [that] defines a markup language for accessing data in a database." (Abstract). Nowhere in the cited text of Monday can Applicant find any teaching or suggestion of referencing, dynamically loading, and dynamically configuring a system service, as recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that the use of document type definitions (DTDs) as disclosed by Monday fails to teach or suggest Applicant's use of parsing to dynamically utilize a system service as required by MPEP § 2131. Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable over the cited reference. Claims 22-24, 26, and 27 depend from and further limit claim 21 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 28-31, 33, and 34

Claim 28 contains limitations similar to claim 21 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as those described above with respect to claim 21. Claims 29-31, 33, and 34 depend from and further limit claim 28 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 28.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Dependent claims 25 and 32 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Monday in view of U.S. Patent 6,480,865 to Lee et al. ("Lee"). However, claims 25 and 32 depend from and further limit claims 21 and 28, respectively, which are both allowable as

- 7 -

described above. As Lee fails to remedy the previously described deficiencies of Monday, claims 25 and 32 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 21 and 28.

New claim 35

New claim 35 recites a method for parsing in a distributed directory-enabled application environment using an eXtensible Markup Language ("XML") application program interface, the interface including a class factory, the method comprising: parsing an XML input file to identify an object; determining whether the object references a system service; if the service is referenced and not loaded, dynamically loading the service; dynamically configuring the service; and instantiating the object in the class factory, so that the service referenced by the object in the XML stream is automatically available to the object.

The cited references, either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each element of claim 35 as required by MPEP § 2131 and MPEP § 2143. Accordingly, claim 35 is allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 21, 28, and 35 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 22-27 and 29-34 depend from and further limit their respective independent claims and are also in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the below listed number to discuss any further issues.

- 8 -

Respectfully submitted,

David O'Dell
Registration No. 42,044

Dated: December 30, 2003
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972/739-8635
File: 26530.57
R-63548_1.DOC

EXPRESS MAIL NO.: EV333436817

DATE OF DEPOSIT: December 30, 2003

This paper and fee are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Post Office to Addressee service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Gayle Conner